

DRAFT
2 March 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller
THROUGH : Deputy Director for Support
SUBJECT : Training and Career Development

1. Introduction

This paper examines the relationship -- part, present and projected -- between training provided the officer corps of the Agency and its value to their overall professional development. By no means definitive, and concentrating largely on those areas in which the Office of Training has been involved directly, the information presented here reflects growing realization of the need for more precise correlation between training and career development at all levels of the organization. At the same time, it reveals an actual evolution of training programs and opportunities to satisfy this need.

2. Training Emphasis -- An Historical Account

Conceived as a service - or support-oriented function within the Agency, training has responded to needs expressed by operating components and in a rather remarkable way has corresponded closely to the Agency's perception of itself during slightly more than 24 years' existence.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06207A000200090002-5

Through perhaps the first decade and a half of this period, the organization was expanding, the employee force relatively young. Supervisory and managerial personnel, as well as many officers performing specialized functions, relied on pre-Agency experience and training to carry out their responsibilities. Consequently, the initial role of training in the Agency was drawn largely in terms of newly arriving employees, introducing them to the world of intelligence and preparing them for their initial assignments as operations officers, analysts, support officers, etc. Such training as was given to experienced officers was geared to particular job demands and, for the most part, did not pretend to prepare them for broader range responsibilities or even to provide an expanded perspective within which they performed their specified tasks.

Although a management training capability was developed in the mid-1950s, as described in our paper on this subject prepared for you earlier, enrollment in such training was neither extensive nor on a systematic basis. The evolution of training which was taking place at this time consisted largely of updating the information and skills imparted to junior officers, with occasional advanced offerings in specialized fields such as covert action and counterintelligence.

3. ^{The Beginning}
Acceptance of Maturing

A marked break in this pattern occurred in 1963. Recognizing that the junior officers of the 1950s were by then midcareerists and the

Approved For Release 2001/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06207A000200090002-5

CONFIDENTIAL - 2 -

likely source of a later generation of senior officers, the Office of Training introduced⁹ the Midcareer Executive Development Program.

This program was twofold. It consisted, first, of a six-week course designed to "open up" carefully chosen officers in all Directorates to the totality of Agency mission⁵ and functions; to develop their understanding of the role of intelligence in national security and foreign relations; and to provide them with an appreciation of the policymaking mechanisms of the government.

The second, longer range phase of the program required that a five-year career development plan be established for each participating officer, devised jointly by him and his career service. Such plans failed to be implemented in too many instances, however, and this phase subsequently was eliminated. Experience with this facet of the midcareer program would appear to have important implications for efforts to relate training to career development through use of sanctions and will be treated later in this paper.

Despite abandonment of the "executive development" aspect of midcareer training, the Midcareer Course remains an effective vehicle for achieving its initially stated goals of developing for its participants a broader understanding and appreciation of the Agency, the intelligence community, domestic and international factors affecting the U.S. role

foreign affairs, and policymaking within the U.S. government.

More than 1,000 officers throughout the Agency have taken this course since its inception in 1963; moreover, it was the first of several courses developed in response to changing needs, conditions, and personnel patterns within the Agency. Courses which have since been introduced include the Managerial Grid (1964), taken by more than 2,000 Agency officers; the Chiefs of Station Seminar (1964); Advanced Management (Planning) (1967), designed to familiarize officers with the planning, programming and budgeting process; Advanced Intelligence Seminar (1969); and Advanced Operations Course (1970). The Senior Seminar, introduced in the fall of 1971, constitutes a still further milestone by recognizing that midcareerists of the 1960s are emerging as supergrade officers for this decade.

4. Establishing Training Patterns

There are now more than 60 different courses, not including foreign language training courses, conducted or administered by the Office of Training for the benefit of professional employees of the Agency. In contrast to the former emphasis on providing training to incoming junior officers, these courses are designed to meet the needs of a wide spectrum of professional personnel, depending on component affiliation and functional duties, experience and grade level, and need for broadened outlook.

Given the number of courses and the multiplicity of purposes they serve, there is genuine need by managers and supervisors -- as well as individual officers -- in the Agency for guidance about the availability of training appropriate to their purposes.

The Office of Training, consequently, has developed a "Profile of Courses" ^{see} (Attachment ~~A~~) to provide such guidance. Essentially, it consists of a central core or ladder of seven courses which, in our opinion, should be an integral part of the successful officer's total career development. These courses are, with the exception of two in the managerial field, general or "mind stretching" in nature and are intended to complement and enhance one's training and experience in specialized areas.

*managerial
courses are
"mind-stretching"
too*

Accompanying the profile is a list categorizing all OTR courses so that officials in the respective operating components and career services will be able to select appropriate courses or training packages more quickly as well as more systematically than has been possible heretofore.

As a next step, we hope to designate, in consultation with appropriate officials throughout the Agency, training packages or patterns which would be regarded as standard, though not inflexibly so, for "line" officers in selected career services. Included in such packages would be the entire range of training opportunities -- internal and external.

5. Criteria for Admission to Core Courses

Concurrent with the development of the Profile and categorization of courses, we also are issuing revised descriptions for all OTR courses in the forthcoming Training Catalogue. The most salient new feature of these course descriptions is an enumeration of criteria by which officers should be selected for enrollment.

With regard to courses which provide training in functional skills, these criteria relate typically to prior experience, or its lack, and assignment in the functional field for which the training is tailored.

In the case of core courses, the criteria relate more to age and grade considerations, to coincide generally with an officer's progress and advancement in the Agency. Such criteria also indicate that selection for these courses, after the initial five years of employment, should be weighed carefully, taking into account an officer's performance record and potential for further professional growth.

The Office of Training, however, has not presumed to control student selection nor, except in occasional instances of obvious mis-enrollment, denied a training opportunity to an officer whose component insisted on it. There have been, and are, instances in which we have stipulated prerequisite training or experience for a given course. Our experience with this practice has not been satisfactory, however.

Operating components, especially the Clandestine Service for whom a large part of OTR training is conducted, frequently experience problems in providing sufficient lead time for training an officer for a projected assignment. Consequently, requests for waivers of prerequisites are common and, rather than stand by while an officer proceeds to an assignment with any appropriate training whatever, OTR has been reluctant to ^{impose} ~~set~~ prerequisites and ^{has been} liberal in granting waivers to those few which have been established.

Training initiatives and criteria are uneven throughout the Agency, varying from Directorate to Directorate and from branch to branch. In some cases, the individual officer acts as his own personnel and training officer by seeking enrollment; in others, a conscious management decision is made by supervisors; and in still others, an officer is sent to training until a more definitive use of his time and services is determined. We are neither empowered nor sufficiently cognizant of circumstances in every case to pass judgment on the suitability of a component's training selection practices. The combination of personnel management's being decentralized and training's being a support activity are, of course, major factors in lack of planning for training and uniform observance of selection criteria. This diversity is not without its strong points, however, given the

varied occupational endeavors in any one career service and the opportunity for individual officers to demonstrate both initiative and , motivation toward training as in other matters.

6. Training Sanctions

ILLEGIB

In general, we believe that imposition of training sanctions, insofar as officer promotion is concerned, is not an advisable course of action. Were there to be an Agency-wide regulation stipulating, for example, that officers lacking the Midcareer Course could not be promoted to GS-14, the Office of Training would not be able to offer the course frequently enough -- due to insufficient resources -- to satisfy the demand. The same would be true of a sanction against an officer's being appointed a section, desk or branch chief unless he, or she had completed the Principles of Supervision and Management course.

Our records indicate that only about half the new professional employees fulfill the regulatory requirement ^{25X1A} that they take the Intelligence and World Affairs Course.

Conversely, the existence of sanctions, we think, would create a high degree of expectation among officers who satisfy them. Many officers who had been selected for participation in the Midcareer Executive Development Program were severely disappointed when the five-year plans established for their professional development were not implemented.

Many returned to the precise positions from which they had been selected or otherwise failed to achieve any recognizable career "development". As mentioned earlier, this critical phase of the midcareer program had to be abandoned.

For many years the legend prevailed within the Clandestine Service that unless an officer were a graduate of the Junior Officer or Career Training Program he could not expect equal treatment in terms of promotion and assignment. There are large numbers of officers in the CS who believe, rightly or wrongly, they have been discriminated against for this reason.

The Agency's experience with foreign language sanctions is probably the most well-known case of a good idea gone awry. Waivers to foreign language position requirements overseas have been used with such variance as to make them meaningless. Officers failing to meet, say, a foreign language competence level of 3 as demanded by a given position have been assigned to the job, nevertheless, on the grounds that ^{having some competence they would} eventually they will work up to the level designated.

Sanctions, whether formal or informal, obviously can have unfortunate aberrations. They do have utility in selected circumstances, however, as for example in the enrollment of CS officers in the Chiefs of Station Seminar prior to their assuming such position overseas or

in requiring officers headed for high risk areas abroad to take the Risk of Capture Course beforehand. Compliance with these particular sanctions has been impressive.

The acid test of sanctions almost certainly is the demonstrated value of training, in a very pragmatic way, to a particular function or undertaking. Consequently, we are increasingly concerned about feedback mechanisms through which the applicability and validity of training may be ascertained. We have begun a modest effort in developing and using such mechanisms, but the program is still very much in the embryonic stage. We anticipate pursuing this matter with operating components further. Once validity is clearly established for a particular course or training program, the question of training sanctions can be entertained more seriously than we think is now possible.

Although the validity of many of our key courses has yet to be established definitively, there is no question that several of them have fostered considerable competition for enrollment. The Basic Operations Course has been, and continues to be, regarded within the Clandestine Service as absolutely essential training for the junior operations officer. Enrollment regularly is oversubscribed.

The selection process throughout the Agency for the Midcareer Course is still such that most components choose their most highly

qualified officers available. Competition for enrollment in the Advanced Intelligence Seminar is similarly intense, forcing components to make qualitative judgments about the suitability of their candidates. We anticipate that as they become better known the same will be true of the Advanced Operations Course and the Senior Seminar. Thus, existing selection procedures constitute a kind of winnowing process even without the presence of sanctions.

7. Alternate Approaches

Once the Agency agrees on a profile of courses and we are able to compose training prototypes for representative officers within the various Directorates, we believe there will not be serious need for training sanctions. Agency management would have typical profiles against which to judge whether or not at a given level an officer had been properly trained. Moreover, we believe that distinct allowance must be made for an officer's development through experience in ways which training cannot hope to provide.

It may be possible, and we are pursuing this proposition, to prove by an audit of personnel and training records that the well-trained officer does move ahead more quickly than the one who is not. While such advancement might be due equally to other factors, such as the officer's own abilities and ambitions, realization among his colleagues

that he is well-trained will nevertheless arouse more constructive interest in training than is likely to be achieved by sanctions.

A key improvement, in our estimation, ^would be the integration of training with personnel management within the several career services and operating components. Basically, aside from the obvious need to make senior managers more training conscious, this should consist of an upgrading of the role and qualifications of component training officers and their inclusion as members of career service boards.

This is already in the case in the JDI.

There are few full-time training officers in Agency components, but where they exist, as in the Office of Communications, Technical Services Division, Office of Logistics, and National Photographic Interpretation Center, among others, they perform an invaluable service and carry considerable weight in terms of personnel management.

At present, there are approximately 48 component training officers plus five Senior Training Officers. These individuals range in grade from GS-08 to GS-16, hold varying types of jobs, with wide areas of responsibility, and with extremely different "charters" from the Office Director or Division Chief as the case may be.

Not only are most of them part-time training officers, but they tend to be administrative or support personnel with neither substantive experience in the components in which they are serving nor with firsthand

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06207A000200090002-5

knowledge of training functions and curriculum. The Office of Training briefs newly-appointed training officers and conducts annual orientation programs for all of them, but such procedures really are not sufficient to overcome the built-in inadequacies of the system cited above. Consequently, we believe a very basic change of managerial philosophy and practice is essential in this area if training is to become an essential tool of personnel management and development.

A less sweeping, but nevertheless important change would be the addition of a training section to the Field Reassignment Questionnaire as a means of stimulating supervisors and affected officers to give some considered thought to training requirements and opportunities. This would necessitate the availability of some version of the Training Catalogue overseas, presumably in an abbreviated and sterilized edition.

8. Conclusion

In view of the circumstances described in this paper, we believe there are a number of steps which already have been taken to promote a cogent integration of training with career development. Primarily, these consist of a system of core or ladder courses intended to complement and enhance training which a professional officer receives in specialized fields. It includes also a more precise statement of selection criteria and a categorization of OTR courses which ought to make easier

the selection of appropriate training for a given officer.

Other steps which are contemplated or recommended are , the development of prototype training packages for "line" officers in the various Directorates; an audit of personnel and training records to determine if well-trained officers do in fact advance more quickly in the Agency; efforts to establish validity of training programs by use of improved feedback mechanisms; strengthening the role of the component training officer and giving formal attention to training considerations as part of career service board deliberations and completion of the Field Reassignment Questionnaire.

We believe that with constructive progress in these areas, there would be no need to resort to training sanctions.

25X1A
[REDACTED]

Acting Director of Training

Att